

**Application No.:** 10/691,470  
**Filing Date:** October 22, 2003

### **REMARKS**

The following remarks are responsive to the March 20, 2009 Final Office Action. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the claims in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

#### ***Summary of the Office Action***

In the March 20, 2009 Final Office Action, Claims 39-57 and 62 stand rejected. Claims 39, 40, 43-46, 48, 56 and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,074,790 issued to Bauer. Claims 41, 42, 47 and 49-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer. Claims 53-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,466,748 issued to Christensen. Claim 62 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,520,540 issued to Nardi.

#### ***Traversal of Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)***

Claims 39, 40, 43-46, 48, 56 and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bauer. In the Final Office Action, Examiner suggests that Applicant needs to more structurally define the torque engagement segment in order to overcome the prior art rejection. In response, Applicant has amended claim 39 to include the limitation, "said torque segment comprising at least one flat surface on an outer surface of the torque segment." Applicant respectfully asserts that this limitation satisfies Examiner's request for greater structural definition of the torque engagement segment in a manner that overcomes the prior art. Specifically, Bauer does not disclose a torque engagement segment positioned below the neck portion that has at least one flat surface. *See* Bauer FIG. 1, 2, element 6.

Applicant submits that Bauer fails to disclose the aforementioned limitation in Claim 39. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 39 and the dependent Claims 40, 43-46, 48, 56 and 57 and indicate that these claims are allowable over the prior art.

**Application No.:** 10/691,470  
**Filing Date:** October 22, 2003

***Traversal of Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

In the Office Action, Claims 41, 42, 47 and 49-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer. Claims 53-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer in view of Christensen. Claim 62 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer in view of Nardi.

In light of the remarks made above traversing Claim 39 over the Bauer reference, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent Claims 41, 42, 47, 49-52, 53-55 and 62 are patentable and not obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art in view of any or all of the aforementioned prior art references. Moreover, the various combinations of prior art suggested by Examiner do not teach or disclose each and every element of the dependent Claims 41, 42, 47, 49-52, 53-55 and 62.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 41, 42, 47, 49-52, 53-55 and 62 for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable base Claim 39, and indicate that these claims are allowable over the prior art.

**No Disclaimers or Disavowals**

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, the Applicant is not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. The Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that the Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the above rejections and objections have been overcome and that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Therefore,

**Application No.:** 10/691,470  
**Filing Date:** October 22, 2003

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate that Claims 39-57 and 62 are now acceptable and allowed. Accordingly, early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is most earnestly solicited.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance in view of the above remarks. Any remarks in support of patentability of one claim, however, should not be imputed to any other claim, even if similar terminology is used. Additionally, any remarks referring to only a portion of a claim should not be understood to base patentability on that portion; rather, patentability must rest on each claim taken as a whole. Applicant respectfully traverse each of the Examiner's rejections and each of the Examiner's assertions regarding what the prior art shows or teaches, even if not expressly discussed herein. Applicant also has not presented arguments concerning whether the applied references can be properly combined in view of, among other things, the clearly missing elements noted above, and Applicant reserves the right to later contest whether a proper reason exists to combine these references and to submit indicia of the non-obviousness of the claimed management system.

The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to all of the rejections in the case and to place the claim and drawings in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicant's attorney in order to resolve such issue promptly.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

5-1-09

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Rabinder N. Narula  
Registration No. 53,371  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(949) 760-0404